This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning documents will not correct images, please do not report the images to the Image Problem Mailbox.





UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/843,452 04/26/2001		Michael J. Narayan	MFCP.81824	8292			
5251	7590	07/28/2004	•	EXA	EXAMINER		
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON LLP				CHANKO	CHANKONG, DOHM		
2555 GRAND BLVD							
KANSAS CITY,, MO 64108				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
				2152			

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•)	/ `			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	- Apr	(
Office Action Summary		09/843,452	NARAYAN ET AL.	U				
		Examiner	Art Unit					
		Dohm Chankong	2154					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	e correspondence addre	∌SS				
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. In maions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to become ABANDO	e timely filed days will be considered timely. om the mailing date of this comm NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.				
Status	•							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 Ja	anuary 2002.						
2a) <u></u>	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for alloward	nce except for formal matters, p	prosecution as to the m	erits is				
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	ion of Claims	•						
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)□	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are rejected.							
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.						
Applicati	ion Papers							
	The specification is objected to by the Examine							
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	3ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct							
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	xaminer. Note the attached Offi	ce Action or form PTO-	-152.				
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119	,						
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document		(a)-(d) or (f).					
	2. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received in Applic	ation No					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio		ived in this National St	age				
* 5	application from the International Bureat See the attached detailed Office action for a list	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ived					
		or the doranted dopress flot rese	Vou.					
Attachmen	at(s)							
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summa	ary (PTO-413)					
2) Notic	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mai	Date					
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	al Patent Application (PTO-18	5∠)				

DETAILED ACTION

I. Claims 1-18 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
 - a. The following claim lacks proper antecedent basis:
 - Claim 1, line 5: "the provided list".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 5. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Olson et al, U.S Patent No. 5.987.376 ("Olson").

6. As to claim 1, Olson discloses a method for use in a computer system, operating in a peer-to-peer environment having a host peer and at least one non-host peer, and for ordering operation requests of the peers, the operation requests being one of a list of recognized operations which may be requested (abstract, column 1, lines 53-60, column 3, lines 27-35; the list of player actions are operation requests, the request by a client to enter a session is equivalent to an operation request), comprising:

receiving, by the host peer, at least one operation request from the provided list (column 3, lines 32-33; host client); and

assigning, by the host peer, a unique version number to the at least one operation request (column 3, lines 33-43 and column 7, lines 47-64; system player IDs are attached to player actions for identification to other players in the network).

- 7. As to claim 2, Olson discloses the method further comprising processing, by the host peer, the operation requests in the order of the assigned version number (column 11, lines 59-61).
- 8. As to claim 3, Olson discloses the method further comprising sending, by the host peer, an operation order and assigned version number to each peer in the peer-to-peer environment, the order and the version number being associated with the operation request (claim 1[b]-[c]).
- 9. As to claim 4, Olson discloses the method further comprising processing, by the receiving peer, the operation order in the order of the assigned version number

(column 3, lines 43-51 and column 9, lines 41-49, claim 11; state update packets stored in a queue and update the client in the order received).

- 10. As to claim 5, Olson discloses the method wherein the operations are name table operations (column 7, line 65 to column 8, line 6 and column 11, lines 48-65).
- II. Claim 6 is a computer readable medium that executes the steps of the method of claim 1. Therefore, claim 6 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in above paragraph 6, for claim 1.
- 12. Claim 7 is a computer readable medium that executes the steps of the method of claim 1. Therefore, claim 7 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in above paragraph 6, for claim 1.
- As to claim 8, Olson discloses a method for use in a computer system, operating in a peer-to-peer environment having a host peer and at least one non-host peer, and for ordering operation requests of the peers, the operation requests being one of a list of recognized operations which may be requested (abstract, column 1, lines 53-60, column 3, lines 27-35; the list of player actions are operation requests, the request by a client to enter a session is equivalent to an operation request), comprising:

sending, by the non-host peer, at least one operation request from the provided list to the host peer (column 3, lines 32-33; host client, claim 14); and

receiving, by the non-host peer, a unique version number to the at least one operation request (column 3, lines 33-43 and column 7, lines 47-64, claim 14; system player IDs are attached to player actions for identification to other players in the network).

- As to claim 9, Olson discloses the method further comprising processing, by the receiving user, the operation order in the order of the assigned version number (column 3, lines 43-51 and column 9, lines 41-49, claim 11; state update packets stored in a queue and update the client in the order received, its number in the queue equivalent to a version number).
- As to claim 10, Olson discloses the method further comprising determining whether the assigned version number received is the next in the sequence of version numbers processed by the receiving non-host peer, and if it is not, queuing the operation order until the version number is next in the sequence of version numbers processed by the receiving peer (column 9, lines 41-61, claim 14).
- 16. Claim II is a computer readable medium that performs the steps of the method of claim 8. Therefore, claim II is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in above paragraph 13, for claim 8.

- 17. Claim 12 is a computer system that performs the steps of the method of claim 8. Therefore, claim 12, is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in above paragraph 13, for claim 8.
- 18. As to claim 13, Olson discloses a method for use in a computer system, operating in a peer-to-peer environment having a current host peer and at least one non-host peer, and for selecting a new host peer (Figure 2D), comprising:

providing each peer with an assigned indicia indicative of the order in which the peer first joined the peer-to-peer environment (column 10, lines 61; lowest numeric unique identifier);

determining whether the current host peer has terminated participation in the peer-to-peer environment (column 11, lines 52-54), and if so:

determining, by each remaining peer, if said peer has the lowest indicia indicating said peer joined the peer-to-peer environment prior to any remaining peers (column 10, lines 59-61); and if so:

sending, by said peer to each remaining peer, a message indicating that said peer is the new host peer (column 11, lines 57-59 and lines 62-67, Figure 2a).

19. As to claim 14, Olson discloses the method wherein operations within the peer-to-peer environment are performed utilizing a name table, and wherein said assigned indicia is a version number of a name table operation creating the peer (column 7, line 65 to column 8, line 6 and column 11, lines 59-61).

Art Unit: 2154

- 20. As to claim 15, Olson discloses the method further comprising requesting, by the new host peer from each remaining peer, the latest version of the name table that each remaining peer has processed (Figure 2a, items 76, 32, 70, 72 and 74 and column 11, lines 62-65).
- As to claim 16, Olson discloses the method further comprising determining, by the new host peer, whether any name table operations have been processed by the other peers and not the new host peer, and if so, updating, by the new host peer, the name table of the new host peer and performing, by the new host peer, the missing name table operations (column 11, lines 62-67, column 13, lines 13-23; client C sends update information to client A (host) whereby client can update his application data).
- As to claim 17, Olson discloses the method further comprising, sending, by the new host peer, the updates to the name table to each remaining peer (Figure 2a, column 11, lines 62-67; where the new host peer performs the same operations as the previous host, and the previous host updates the peers with the name table).
- Claim 18 is a computer readable medium that performs the steps of the method of claim 13. Therefore, claim 18 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in above paragraph 18, for claim 13.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of art in regards to peer-to-peer communications and host peers:

U.S Patent No. 5.695.400 to Fennell, Jr. et al;

U.S Patent No. 6.065.062 to Periasamy et al;

U.S Patent No. 6.311.209 to Olson et al.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art in regards to prioritized peer-to-peer communications:

U.S Reissued Patent US RE38 134E to Ross et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dohm Chankong whose telephone number is (703)305-8864. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DC

ZARNI MAUNG PRIMARY EXAMINER